

REMARKS

This paper is responsive to the Final Office Action dated September 7, 2006. All rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicant and Applicant's undersigned attorney wish to thank Examiner Sun for his helpfulness in a telephone interview held on May 21, 2007. The present paper is intended to reflect the substance of that discussion and the helpful suggestions of the Examiner.

Claims 1, 12 and 23 have been amended to include the features of the now cancelled claims 2 and 13.

At paragraphs 4-11 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5, 9-13, 16 and 20-23 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 based on the combination of published United States patent application 2002/0136038 of Spitacls et al. ("Spitacls et al.") and United States patent 6,131,125 of Rostoker et al. ("Rostoker et al."). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Spitacls et al. discloses an uninterruptible power supply and a multipurpose data port that facilitates a plurality of communication methods between the uninterruptible power supply and a host computer system. A multipurpose data port of Spitacls et al. is configured to prevent interference if a user mistakenly connects a phone line or other similar but inappropriate line to the uninterruptible power supply.

Rostoker et al. disclose a protocol translation cable assembly including translation circuitry coupled to at least some of a plurality of wires of the cable at points between pins of a first connector and pins of a second connector. The Rostoker et al. cable assembly provides "plug-and-play" capabilities where the cable communicates with a first communication protocol

at a first end, and a second communication protocol at the second end, for example through translation between USB communication protocol at one end and Ethernet communication protocol at the other end of the cable.

Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al. fails to disclose or suggest any method or system for connecting a device to a central system that includes:

detecting the insertion of a cable connector into a slot in said central system, wherein said cable connector is integral to a cable that is terminated by said cable connector, wherein said cable is communicably connected to said device at an opposite end of a cable from said cable connector;

reading, through said slot, *configuration information stored in a memory contained within said cable connector, wherein said configuration information includes information describing said device;* and

configuring said central system in response to said configuration information read from said memory contained within said cable connector. (emphasis added)

As in the present independent claim 1. Independent claims 12 and 23 include analogous features. In contrast, the multipurpose dataport of Spitacls et al. includes no memory for storing information of any kind, while in Rostoker et al. the communication protocol driver is used only to configure the protocol translating circuitry *within the cable*. Nothing in either Spitacls et al. or Rostoker et al. teaches or suggests even the desirability of reading, through a slot in a central system, configuration information stored in a memory contained within a cable connector inserted into the slot, wherein the configuration information includes information describing a device at an opposite end of the cable connector, and configuring the central system in response to the configuration information, as in the present independent claims 1, 12, and 23.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combination of Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al. does not disclose or suggest all the features of the present independent claims

1, 12 and 23. Accordingly, the combination of Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al. does not support a *prima facie* case of obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103 with regard to claims 1, 12 and 23. As to claims 2, 5, 9-11, 13, 16 and 20-22, they each depend from claims 1 and 12, and are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al. for at least the same reasons.

At paragraphs 12-18 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 for obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103, again citing Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al., and additionally citing United States patent number 6,081,782 of Rabin ("Rabin").

As discussed above, Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al. fail to disclose or suggest reading, through a slot in a central system, configuration information stored in a memory contained within a cable connector inserted into the slot, wherein the configuration information includes information describing a device at an opposite end of the cable connector, and configuring the central system in response to the configuration information, as in the present independent claims 1 and 12. This shortcoming of the combination of Spitacls et al. and Rostoker et al. is not remedied by further combination with the teachings of Rabin, which includes a description of a database to store speech models and other user information in column 4. Accordingly, the combination of Spitacls et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin also fails to disclose or suggest reading, through a slot in a central system, configuration information stored in a memory contained within a cable connector inserted into the slot, wherein the configuration information includes information describing a device at an opposite end of the cable connector, and configuring the central system in response to the configuration information, as in the present independent claims 1 and 12, from which claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 depend.

For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully urges that the combined teachings of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin fail to disclose all the features of the present independent claims 1 and 12. Accordingly, the combination of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin does not form a *prima facie* case of obviousness with regard to independent claims 1 and 12, and dependent claims 3, 4, 6-8, 14, 15 and 17-19 are respectfully believed to be patentable over the combination of Spitaels et al., Rostoker et al., and Rabin for at least the same reasons.

Reconsideration of all pending claims is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned, Applicants' Attorney at 617-630-1131 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

May 25, 2007  
Date

/David Dagg/  
David Dagg, Reg. No. 37,809  
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)  
McGuinness & Manaras LLP  
125 Nagog Park  
Acton, MA 01720  
(617) 630-1131